1	KAMALA D. HARRIS	
2	Attorney General of California MARC D. GREENBAUM	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General LESLIE A. WALDEN	
4	State Bar No. 196882 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702	
5	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2540	•
6	Facsimile: (213) 897-2804  Attorneys for Complainant	
7	BEFORE THE	
8	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS	
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 3883
11	ARTURO MILTON MENDOZA	ACCUSATION
12	a.k.a., ARTURO MILTON VILLELA a.k.a., ARTURO MILTON BELTRAN	ACCUSATION
13	a.k.a., ARTURO VILLEA MENDOZA a.k.a., ARTURO VILLELA MENDOZA	
14	a.k.a., ARTURO V. MENDOZA a.k.a., ARTURO MENDOZA	
15	a.k.a., RAY CHAVEZ a.k.a., ARTURO VILLELA MENDOSA	
16	2704 Union Street Rialto, CA 92376	
17	Pharmacy Technician Registration	
18	No. TCH 49387  Respondent.	
19		
20	Complainant alleges:	
21   22	<u>PARTIES</u>	
23	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity	
24	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.	
25	2. On or about January 3, 2005, the Board of Pharmacy (Board) issued Pharmacy	
26	Technician Registration No. TCH 49387 to Arturo Milton Mendoza, also known as Arturo Milton	
27	Villela, Arturo Milton Belran, Arturo Villea Mendoza, Arturo Villela Mendoza, Arturo V.	
28	///	

Mendoza, Arturo Mendoza, Ray Chavez, and Arturo Villela Mendosa (Respondent). The Pharmacy Technician Registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on April 30, 2014, unless renewed.

#### **JURISDICTION**

3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

## **STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

- 4. Section 118, subdivision (b), provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.
  - 5. Section 490 states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) In addition to any other action that a board is permitted to take against a licensee, a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.
- "(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a board may exercise any authority to discipline a licensee for conviction of a crime that is independent of the authority granted under subdivision (a) only if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the licensee's license was issued.
- "(c) A conviction within the meaning of this section means a plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere. Any action that a board is permitted to take following the establishment of a conviction may be taken when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code."
- 6. Section 4300 provides, in pertinent part, that every license issued by the Board is subject to discipline, including suspension or revocation.

///

2.7

7. Section 4301 states, in pertinent part:

"The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty of unprofessional conduct or whose license has been procured by fraud or misrepresentation or issued by mistake.

Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

. . . .

- "(f) The commission of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or corruption, whether the act is committed in the course of relations as a licensee or otherwise, and whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not.
- "(g) Knowingly making or signing any certificate or other document that falsely represents the existence or nonexistence of a state of facts.
- "(h) The administering to oneself, of any controlled substance, or the use of any dangerous drug or of alcoholic beverages to the extent or in a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to oneself, to a person holding a license under this chapter, or to any other person or to the public, or to the extent that the use impairs the ability of the person to conduct with safety to the public the practice authorized by the license.

. . . .

- "(j) The violation of any of the statutes of this state, or any other state, or of the United States regulating controlled substances and dangerous drugs.
- "(k) The conviction of more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or self-administration of any dangerous drug or alcoholic beverage, or any combination of those substances.
- "(1) The conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. The record of conviction of a violation of Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 801) of Title 21 of the United States Code regulating controlled substances or of a violation of the statutes of this state regulating controlled substances or dangerous drugs shall be conclusive evidence of unprofessional conduct. In all other cases, the record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence only of the fact that the conviction occurred. The board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, in order

to fix the degree of discipline or, in the case of a conviction not involving controlled substances or dangerous drugs, to determine if the conviction is of an offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a licensee under this chapter. A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this provision. The board may take action when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing the person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment."

8. Health and Safety Code section 11550, subdivision (a) states, in pertinent part:

"No person shall use, or be under the influence of any controlled substance which is (1) specified in subdivision (b), (c), or (e), or paragraph (1) of subdivision (f) of Section 11054, specified in paragraph (14), (15), (21), (22), or (23) of subdivision (d) of Section 11054, specified in subdivision (b) or (c) of Section 11055, or specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of subdivision (d) or in paragraph (3) of subdivision (e) of Section 11055, or (2) a narcotic drug classified in Schedule III, IV, or V, except when administered by or under the direction of a person licensed by the state to dispense, prescribe, or administer controlled substances."

## REGULATORY PROVISIONS

9. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770 states, in pertinent part:

"For the purpose of denial, suspension, or revocation of a personal or facility license pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Business and Professions Code, a crime or act shall be considered substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee or registrant if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a licensee or registrant to perform the functions authorized by his license or registration in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare."

////

28 | ////

#### **COST RECOVERY**

10. Section 125.3 provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

#### 11. CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

- a. "Ativan," is the brand name for Lorazepam, a Benzodiazepine derivative. It is a Schedule IV controlled substance as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11057, subdivision (d)(16) and is categorized as a dangerous drug pursuant to section 4022.
- b. "Heroin," is a semisynthetic drug derived from Morphine. It is a Schedule I controlled substance as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11054, subdivision (c)(11) and is categorized as a dangerous drug pursuant to section 4022.
- c. "Methamphetamine," is a Schedule II controlled substance as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11055, subdivision (d)(2) and is categorized as a dangerous drug pursuant to section 4022.

#### 12. DANGEROUS DRUG

- a. "Benadryl," is the brand name for Diphenhydramine, an antihistamine used for treating allergic reactions and is categorized as a dangerous drug pursuant to section 4022.
- b. "Depakote," is the brand name for Valproic Acid and Divalproex, used for the treatment of convulsions, migraines, bipolar disorder and is categorized as a dangerous drug pursuant to section 4022.
- c. "Prozac," is the brand name for Fluoxetine, a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor and is categorized as a dangerous drug pursuant to section 4022.

## FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Convictions of Substantially Related Crimes)

13. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 4301, subdivision (l) and 490, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1770, in that

27

28

Respondent has been convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a pharmacy technician, as follows:

- On or about May 20, 2009, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one felony count of violating Penal Code section 646.9, subdivision (c)(2) [stalking with prior] in the criminal proceeding entitled The People of the State of California vs. Arturo Villela Mendoza (Super. Ct. San Diego County, 2009, No. SCD219184). The Court sentenced Respondent to serve 270 days in San Diego County Jail and placed him on 3 years formal probation, with terms and conditions. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about January 14, 2009, Respondent made statements and threats to B. M. that caused her to be in fear for her safety and for the safety of her immediate family. On or about January 17, 2009, A San Diego detective interviewed Respondent while he was incarcerated and asked if he was taking any medications. Respondent stated, "I am taking Depacte to stay calm." When asked if he was taking anything else, Respondent stated, "Benadryl and Ativan 1.5 mg." When asked if he understood the questions, Respondent stated, "Yes, I understand you fine." When asked if he called B.M. and threatened to kill her and burn her house down, Respondent stated, "No, I don't even know where she lives." When asked if he wanted to hurt B.M., due to a phone message that he left her, Respondent stated, "No." When asked why he left B.M. the message, Respondent stated, "I don't know, I don't remember leaving her a message. I could have been blacking out, I was drinking at the time. Sometimes I black out when I drink."
- b. On or about March 18, 2008, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) [driving while having a 0.08% and more, by weight, of alcohol in his blood] in the criminal proceeding entitled The People of the *State of California vs. Arturo V. Mendoza* (Super. Ct. San Diego County, 2008, No. S217498). The Court sentenced Respondent to serve 96 hours in San Diego County Jail and placed him on 5 years probation, with terms and conditions. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about February 5, 2008, Respondent drove a vehicle while having 0.08% and more, by weight, of alcohol in his blood, and collided with another vehicle resulting in property damage to another. While speaking to Respondent, the California Highway Patrol

Officer detected an odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from Respondent's person. He was observed to have red watery eyes and a thick slurred speech. While at the scene, Respondent submitted to a Preliminary Alcohol Screening (PAS) Test that resulted in a breath-alcohol content level of 0.260% on the first reading and 0.246% on the second reading.

c. On or about June 5, 2003, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 647, subdivision (a) [lewd conduct] in the criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California vs. Arturo V. Mendoza* (Super. Ct. Riverside County, 2003, No. RIM435514). The Court sentenced Respondent to serve 30 days in Riverside County Jail and placed him on 36 months probation, with terms and conditions. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about April 24, 2003, the Riverside Police Department Officers observed Respondent masturbating in a public park urinal stall.

## SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Dangerous Use of Alcohol)

14. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (h), in that on or about February 5, 2008, Respondent used alcoholic beverages to an extent or in a manner dangerous our injurious to himself, another person, or the public, when he drove a vehicle, while having approximately 0.26% of alcohol in his blood. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth above in paragraph 13, subdivision (b), as though set forth fully.

#### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Use/Under the Influence of a Controlled Substance and/or a Dangerous Drug)

- 15. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivisions (h) and (j), in that Respondent used and/or was under the influence of a controlled substance and/or a dangerous drug, as follows:
- a. On or about January 26, 2009, during an investigation of a male subject standing next to the river without pants, by the San Diego Police Department Officers, Respondent was contacted. While speaking to Respondent, he was observed to be naked from the waist down. He was holding 2 large rocks and indicated to the officers that he had nothing to loose. Respondent

refused to listen to the officers and indicated that he was going to kill himself and wanted to kill his wife and mother. Respondent indicated that he was "God" and "Thor." When asked if he was taking any medications, Respondent stated, "Prozac, but have never taken it." When asked if he had been using any street drugs in the past two weeks, Respondent stated, "Yes, Heroin and Meth." Respondent was detained with force, by two police officers, transported to County Mental Health, and placed on hold, in violation of Welfare and Institutions Code section 5150 [mentally ill].

#### FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Acts Involving Moral Turpitude, Dishonesty, Fraud, or Deceit)

- 16. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (f), in that Respondent committed acts involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, or deceit, as follows:
- a. On or about February 25, 2009, Respondent failed to appear at the San Bernardino Court for arraignment, under Case No. SBHC2918AB, for violating one misdemeanor count of Vehicle Code section 14601.2., subdivision (a) [driving while driver's license is suspended for driving under the influence] and one misdemeanor count of Vehicle Code section 40508, subdivision (a) [failure to appear]. As of April 20, 2012, Respondent is still a fugitive.
- b. On or about January 14, 2009, Respondent was arrested by the San Diego Police Department for violating Penal Code section 422 [threatening with intent to terrorize]. He was subsequently conviction of this crime on May 20, 2009. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth above in paragraph 13, subdivision (a), as though set forth fully.

## FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (Knowingly Made a False Statement of Fact to Licensing Authority)

17. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (g), in that on or about July 14, 2003, Respondent knowingly made a false statement of fact to the Board by failing to disclose his June 5, 2003 conviction case against him on his initial application for licensure and conviction of Record. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the

allegations set forth above in paragraph 13, subdivision (c), as though set forth fully. In addition, Respondent signed and declared under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing was true and correct on his application for licensure.

#### SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

## (Conviction of More than One Misdemeanor or Felony Involving Drugs)

18. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 4301, subdivision (k), in that respondent has been convicted of more than one misdemeanor or felony involving the use, consumption or self administration of a dangerous drug or alcoholic beverage, or any combination of those substances. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 13, subdivisions (a) & (b), 14, and 15 subdivision (a), as though set forth fully.

## **DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 18. In order to determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, Complainant alleges the following:
- a. On or about December 14, 2000, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 166, subdivision (A)(4) [disobeying a court order] in the criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California vs. Arturo Villela Mendoza* (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2000, No. MVA030641). The Court sentenced respondent to serve 180 days in San Bernardino County Jail and ordered him to pay fees and restitution. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about October 5, 2000, Respondent willfully and knowingly disregarded a court order, to wit: Restraining Order.
- b. On or about July 21, 2000, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one felony count of violating Penal Code section 646.9, subdivision (a) [stalking] in the criminal proceeding entitled the *People of the State of California vs. Arturo Villela Mendoza* (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2000, No. FSB026586). The Court sentenced Respondent to serve 58 days in San Bernardino County Jail and placed him on 36 months formal probation, with terms and conditions. On or about December 14, 2000, Respondent was appeared (in custody) and admitted that he had violated the Court's probation order. The Court reinstated Respondent's

previous probation on the same terms and conditions, but, due to the probation violation, modified the previous order to add 365 days in San Bernardino County Jail. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about January 25, 2000, Respondent stalked the victim and reasonably caused her to be in fear for her safety and for the safety of her immediate family.

- c. On or about February 10, 2000, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a) [driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs], one misdemeanor count of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) [driving while having a 0.08% and more, by weight, of alcohol in his blood], and one misdemeanor count of Vehicle Code section 40508, subdivision (a) [failure to appear] in the criminal proceeding entitled The People of the *State of California vs. Arturo Mendoza* (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2000, No. TSB103344). The Court sentenced Respondent to serve 2 days in San Bernardino County Jail, ordered pronouncement of judgment withheld, and conditional and revocable release granted for a period of 36 months, with terms and conditions. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about December 22, 1999, Respondent drove a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or drugs and while having driving while having a 0.08% and more, by weight, of alcohol in his blood. In addition, on or about January 27, 2000, Respondent failed to appear at the San Bernardino County Superior Court for arraignment.
- d. On or about December 21, 2000, after pleading nolo contendere, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 853.7 [failure to appear on written promise] in the criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California vs. Arturo Mendoza* (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2000, No. 240619AM). The Court sentenced respondent to serve 10 days in San Bernardino County Jail and ordered him to pay fees. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about October 4, 2000, Respondent failed to appear on a written promise.
- e. On or about June 6, 2000, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 647, subdivision (f) [disorderly conduct: person under the influence of alcohol or drugs] in the criminal proceeding entitled *The People of*

the State of California vs. Arturo Mendoza (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2000, No. MVA027666). The Court sentenced respondent to serve 15 days in San Bernardino County Jail and ordered him to pay fees and restitution. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about January 16, 2000, Respondent was found to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs and unable to provide for his safety or the safety of others.

f. On or about March 6, 2000, after pleading guilty, Respondent was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 647, subdivision (f) [disorderly conduct: person under the influence of alcohol or drugs] and one misdemeanor count of Penal Code section 853.7 [failure to appear on written promise] in the criminal proceeding entitled The People of the State of California vs. Arturo Mendoza (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, 2000, No. 604722AM). The Court ordered Respondent to pay fees and fines. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are that on or about November 6, 1999, Respondent was found to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs and unable to provide for his safety or the safety of others. On or about February 14, 2000, Respondent failed to appear on a written promise.

////

////